

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

Vol. V, No. 10

June 11, 1945

\$1.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

Report from San Francisco

FOR a month San Francisco has been living in a state of genuine excitement. The great Conference of the United Nations has flowed in and flooded the town. Notables from all over the world are seen in the streets. Crowds wait outside the St. Francis Hotel to see Molotov come out and drive off to a meeting of the Big Three. They gape at the Saudi Arabians in their picturesque costume. They go to innumerable meetings at which speakers, semi-official and unofficial, expound the progress and problems of the Conference. They attend innumerable luncheons and dinners in the interest of the Spanish refugees or the Oxford Groups or Korean independence or race discrimination in our own free land or—but to catalogue the causes which are here to be promoted would be to touch most of the problems of the modern world. Between these more serious pursuits there is no dearth of opportunity offered the delegates (who are too busy to take much advantage of it) to sample American food and drinks and to inspect what modest San Franciscans know is the most interesting city and the most spectacular countryside in the land.

And if these San Franciscans are fortunate enough to get tickets they crowd into the Opera House to watch a Plenary Session at work. The city has admirable equipment for the Conference. Next to the Opera House is the Veterans Memorial built after the last war with small halls, many rooms for committees and the like. Across the wide Van Ness Avenue (which stopped the westward course of the great fire in 1906) is the City Hall, the Municipal Auditorium and other buildings, some of which are now put to Conference use.

A Plenary Session is simple, democratic yet impressive as one looks down from one of the balconies on the seats filled with delegates and the stage backed by the flags of the Nations and unfurnished save for the long desk at which sits the Chairman, the Secretary General and the Parliamentarian. It is perhaps a day on which the American Secretary of State presides. He brings the meeting to order. The Rapporteur of the Steering Committee, Ambassador Belt of Cuba, comes to the speaker's platform below the stage, reaches up and shakes hands with

the Chairman and begins his routine report of merely minor technical matters. One then goes beyond routine—everyone listens. The Committee moves that the Ukraine and the White Russian Republics be admitted. There is no dissent. It is done in an instant. Russia has its three votes, say the papers.

That is of course in one sense quite true. But it must be remembered that the ground upon which this action was asked was not that Russia is a great power but that these republics are entitled to direct their own foreign policy and have done magnificent service in the war. It is not likely that these delegates will vote contrary to the Russian delegation; but the interesting fact from the point of view of constitutional history is that their admission means the recognition by the United Nations, as it were, of a new kind of political structure. It lies midway between the British Commonwealth of Nations, bound together by personal ties, and the Federal Union of the United States. The development of this particular aspect of the Russian experiment will be studied with interest.

The business done, four or five excellent addresses follow, according to the plan by which each delegation will have a chance to express its views on the general proposals for an amendment of the Dumbarton Oaks plan. Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada are heard. Mackenzie King speaks for Canada—is particularly good. M. Spaat of Belgium, speaking in French, is eloquent. The meeting adjourns. That is typical of the Plenary Sessions so far. The reporters to whom conflict alone is news have had to look elsewhere for material.

And that may serve to bring us on from these superficial aspects of the Conference to its serious business.

The Church's Part in the Conference

Although an almost unnumbered host of representatives of the press has gathered here in San Francisco for the meeting, they can add only a little local color such as that in the preceding paragraphs to the news which has gone out to all the world. That color is worthwhile no doubt to stimulate interest

but it must be remembered that in general, people in New York or London or Moscow, if they are interested, may know quite as much of the real achievements as the somewhat harried and hurried hosts of the Conference.

And yet the suggestion that the local color is unimportant is not altogether true. CHRISTIANITY AND CRISIS goes to a constituency which is deeply concerned with the extent and character of the influence of the churches upon the achievement of the Conference. It is worthwhile to comment on that question. It helps a little in appraising the work which has been done.

The churches have unquestionably had a real part in creating the right atmosphere for the meeting. The community background for such a gathering is of importance. In an indifferent or hostile atmosphere such as some of the papers and commentators have tried to create, the goodwill, the feeling of neighborliness and of readiness to conciliate would have been increasingly difficult. San Francisco determined otherwise. Everywhere there has been enthusiasm, interest, concern. The churches have taken a real part. Mr. Dulles addressed a huge meeting in Oakland the Sunday before the Conference opened. The Roman Catholics held a meeting in the Civic Auditorium in San Francisco the previous week, addressed by Monsignor Sheen, who, it is true, did not desert his usual role. It nevertheless opened the eyes of thousands to the importance of what was to be done. Smaller meetings were held under church auspices throughout the Bay region. Great United Nation services were held on the first Sunday of the Conference; in the Civic Auditorium by the Roman Catholics; in the Episcopal Cathedral; in practically every church. Women's Guilds, Men's Clubs, were all discussing the meeting of the Conference; and one noticed as well that a very deep note of concern for moral and spiritual issues had crept into many an address given to other groups in the weeks preceding the meeting of the Conference. The concern which church leaders have shown during the past decade for the development of a law-governed world has borne fruit. The churches here were awake to their responsibility for realizing some visible expression of the "One World" to which we all belong.

In the other field of direct effect upon the framing of the Charter it is more difficult to speak, but some points are clear. The State Department, as everyone knows, included in its group of advisers or consultants, representatives of certain church organizations—Federal Council, Church Peace Union, Catholic Welfare, and others. These representatives have worked consistently and steadily to back the

American delegates in giving what Mr. Dulles has called a "soul" to the Charter. They have backed the recommendations for a Commission on Human Rights and have urged the recognition of such in Preamble and definition of the Assembly's work. That is intended to include the repudiation of discrimination on account of race, creed, or color. It leads on to the support of a careful definition of trusteeship, proposals for the development of international law and for the revision of the Charter to keep pace with the movement of human history. As was to be expected, there have been many groups pressing in on the Conference and urging one or another special moral or spiritual interest; enough to draw from Marshal Smuts the remark that the Conference would do better if there were not so many people trying to get in to reform the world. But the semi-official representatives of the religious interests of America seem to have done a good sensible job and helped.

It is in the direction pointed by Mr. Dulles' phrase that the chief modifications of the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals have been made. Those proposals are familiar to all readers of this paper and need not be outlined here.

Procedure of the Conference

But before going on to the consideration of some of the further developments and of the problems as yet waiting decision a word is in order concerning the method of work. In charge of the procedure is the Steering Committee under the Chairmanship of Secretary Stettinius and composed of the heads of the forty-nine delegations. Back of that is the Executive Committee and it must be noted that back of that again are the Big Three or Four or Five as you happen to look at it. While every proposal is to be open for discussion it is not likely that anything important which the great Powers oppose will be carried. But the procedure is designed to make the Conference as different as possible from a mere rubber stamp affair. There are four Major Commissions: General Provisions, Security Council, Assembly and World Court. These again work through Committees. All proposals go through these Committees to the Commissions, and after discussion if necessary back again. As yet no Commission has reported to a Plenary Session and it is probable, since all the Commissions have representatives of every nation, that the Plenary Sessions which finally adopt the Charter will be routine affairs.

The entire structure which the Conference is building is based upon the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. There is no disposition to change the main lines of that document. There will be an Assembly in which

every nation is represented and with equal voting power. It was well that the United States gave up the demand for three votes. Since the Russians are technically correct it would have been the sole legal exception to the rule. The questions concerning the Assembly have turned chiefly on the voting procedure and its responsibilities toward constructive development of international good will and the general welfare. One result has been to establish the proposed Economic and Social Council as a body coordinate with and not subordinate to the Assembly. Another is that the Assembly will have some authority to recommend policies where international friction seems to be arising. It is probably safe to assume that in the future the changes which will come in the structure created here will be in the direction of enlarged powers for the Assembly. If the Security Council works effectively, the primary job of keeping the peace will become increasingly a police activity and altogether subordinate to the matter of increasing good will and cooperative effort to make a freer and more worthwhile world.

The Small Nations and the Veto Power

The thorny question of voting in the Security Council has not as yet been settled. One change from the Dumbarton Oaks proposals will ensure better representation for smaller nations among the elected members. They will be chosen on a regional basis and with some regard for the contribution they have made or can make to the preservation of peace. But the question still arises as to whether unanimity among the permanent members shall be necessary for the use of force. Can a nation veto action against itself? There is much confusion in the thinking about it. People do not realize that unless the great powers hold together and themselves are guiltless of aggression or the attempt to dominate by force the whole structure must inevitably fall to pieces. In America, too, it is always of Russia that people are thinking. They seldom ask themselves what would happen if the United States should become in the eyes of the world the guilty party. It seems likely at this moment that a compromise may be found whereby the accused nation would not in the initial stages of the process judge in its own case.

A very regrettable illustration of the ease with which we do not judge ourselves as we do others is in our own determination to control not as trustees but as "owners" the strategic islands which we have taken from Japan in the Pacific. This is Army and Navy policy. That is unblushingly recognized. It is perhaps the first time that a vital question of national policy is in the way to be settled by the armed forces. It is one of the things we have been fighting against in Germany and Japan. Furthermore there appears to be a complete failure to recognize that to hold as trustees and to report to

the G.I.O. would in no way affect the use of bases. The World Organization exists primarily to ensure peace. But American audiences show suspicion and distrust when Russia tries to ensure friendly governments on her borders, cheer for a free India and then cheer equally when some speaker proclaims that we will never surrender these islands won by the blood of our boys. There is no question as to the feeling of the majority of American people. No doubt the delegates realize that and also know that concessions must be made if the Senate is to ratify. But it is altogether one of the less encouraging factors in the situation. It is also clearly a point on which any clear-visioned Christian thinking must take issue with the popular view.

Regional Agreements

Another difficult question has been the adjustment of regional agreements to the Charter. Everyone applauded the Act of Chapultepec. Few realized at the time that it would create at San Francisco both technical and political problems of adjustment. The Latin American countries found they had voting power. They forced the admission of Argentina. They insisted that the American nations should have authority to act on their own. The United States was caught between two fires. The thing seems to be working out into a reasonable compromise. Most of the delegates recognize that if the G.I.O. is to be a real power it must be the final arbiter. But the situation had for a time ominous possibilities.

One other very important question awaits decision: the status of the World Court. It seems to be agreed that it must in a measure be a new creation. We cannot simply take over the old Court. That is a question for experts. The matter of compulsory jurisdiction, however, touches general national policy. The Big Five are against it. The smaller nations in general favor it. The Big Five will probably win.

Conclusion

Two things in conclusion: It becomes increasingly clear in San Francisco as well as in Europe that the most important factor in all these international affairs is preservation of right relations between the United States and Russia. There can be no doubt that the leading men in both countries recognize that fact. The delegations in San Francisco recognize it.

Molotov made an excellent impression. The leaders can work together. But if the Russian delegation goes back to Moscow with friendly feelings towards us it will be something of a miracle. The most despicable, contemptible attitude has been taken by some of the papers, some of the commentators and one may add, some religious leaders. It is sad, too, to realize how few of the papers have recognized that we are hosts to the representatives of other nations. Democratic freedom of speech and press is

really consistent with acting like gentlemen. It is well for Christian people to keep this clear in mind and keep hammering at it in their talk.

But when all is said and done, there seems to be very general agreement that the spirit of friendly cooperation and conciliation has been dominant. The issues are too important for anything else. A Char-

ter will be created. The world will have a new chance. The people of the United States must take their part in the world of the future. Our immediate task will be to get the Charter ratified by the Senate. The American people will not let themselves be defrauded this time.

EDWARD L. PARSONS.

The Place of the German Church in Post-War Reconstruction

W. A. VISSER 'T HOOFT

General Secretary, World Council of Churches

The following statement covers the situation of the Protestant Church in Germany. It should not be forgotten that the complete picture includes the Roman Catholic Church.

What is left of the church in Germany?

The popular impression that the persecution of the church in Germany has resulted in breaking the church does not correspond to the facts. It is true that the church had been largely ousted from nazi-controlled public life; that the number of pastors and theological students is hopelessly inadequate; that Christian literature is no longer available and that large sections of the population, especially among youth, are almost wholly estranged from Christianity. But it is nonetheless certain that the time of trial has in fact strengthened the church. New energies have been awakened in it; its own inner life is being reorganized in such a way that laymen assume a far greater share of responsibility; many men and women (not only from the middle class but also from intellectual and labor circles), to whom the nihilistic character of national socialism has become clear, have turned to the church for spiritual leadership and (as is unanimously reported from several of the big cities) the evangelistic opportunities are quite unusual.

It is, therefore, no exaggeration to say that the effective *spiritual* vitality and influence of the church in Germany is today greater than it was before the national socialist era.

What has been the attitude of the church to national socialism?

An adequate answer to this question can not yet be given. But this much can be said already. The German Church has certainly not acted sufficiently early and sufficiently energetically in relation to national socialism. It has conceived the church conflict far too much as a conflict in which the church had to defend its own life and not realized from the outset that it had also the mission to defend the Christian bases of European society and to take a clear stand against the practical paganism of nazi politics. The leaders of German Protestantism have during the early years of national socialism strongly condemned the national socialist phi-

losophy but—apart from some notable exceptions—not sufficiently protested against the injustices, the persecutions and crimes which grew out of that philosophy. More recently, however, the realization that the total negation of Christian standards demands the total affirmation of Christian convictions has become far more general in the church. And in a number of cases (euthanasia, extermination of Jews) clear protests have been made. The actions of Bishop Wurm and his colleagues should be mentioned especially.

The number of church leaders who are nazis by conviction is extremely small. (The so-called "German Christians" are no longer of importance.) The number of church leaders who (like Bishop Mahrrens and his "*Vertrauensrat*") paid lip service to the regime for "tactical" reasons is larger. But the group of those who have no illusions about nazism and realize that no compromise is possible has been continuously gaining in strength during the last years.

The church as such has not played a direct role in organized political resistance. But it is a fact that among those who have worked for the overthrow of the regime there is a very considerable percentage of active churchmen. After the revolt of July 20, 1944, the German church had lost some of its most prominent laymen and several outstanding church leaders were imprisoned. The active resistance groups counted very strongly on the church as one of the main forces which were to eradicate nazism from the hearts and heads of the Germans and to play a prominent part in the rebuilding of the nation.

Who will lead the church in post-war Germany?

During the last two years very far-reaching and precise plans have been worked out by a group of men representing the old confessional front (Niemöller), the South German Churches and a number of other circles. The man who has been at the center of this planning is Bishop Wurm. The plans include not only the reorganization of the church and the mobilization of all energies for the evangelistic and educational task, but also very radical changes in its leadership. It is agreed that the leaders who have sympathized with the regime or refused to take a clear stand have to be replaced, and to be replaced by men who have shown them-

selves to be defenders of the faith. At the same time the tendency is to create a number of new bishoprics and to select younger men for these places of leadership. Thus not only the "German Christians" but also the compromisers and opportunists such as Mahrarens will have to make way for men who have taken a straightforward anti-nazi attitude.

What will be the place of the church in post-war Germany?

That place will be characterized by three facts:

(a) The post-war Germany will be a sobered Germany which suddenly realizes that its reasons for existence were mirages and false illusions and which will look with horror into a great void. There will be an intense longing for clear answers to the question of life's meaning and an eager demand for *spiritual substance* to fill the vacuum left by nihilism. If the church can speak the liberating word, it will meet with a response such as it has not known for a long time.

(b) The church is the only important institution in Germany which has *survived* in the national socialist era. Other institutions have disappeared or been "adapted" in such a way that they have lost their identity. The church, while not undamaged, has saved and even intensified its spiritual substance. It has not merely survived but shown a tenacity and vitality, sometimes even a power of resistance which has surprised the outsiders. The result is that among the people indifference has made way for spiritual curiosity and often also for active interest.

(c) The church is, at least in this first period after the breakdown of national socialism, the *only coherent body* left in the country. For the whole nazified system of political, social and cultural organizations has collapsed and its leaders will be brought to justice or have disappeared. The only institution which is present in each region is the church.

Because of these three circumstances, it is likely that in the first months and years following the cessation of hostilities the church will have a very strategic position in the country.

How can the church help in the realm of relief and social work?

If the church proves to be the one remaining coherent institution in Germany, it is clear that it will have to play a considerable role in the realm of relief and social work—at least temporarily. Now that the immense and complicated machinery of national socialist society breaks down, the church will have to accept responsibilities which it would never accept in normal times. It will have to be instrumental in setting up provisional organs which will take measures of relief to the evacuated, the displaced and homeless millions in the destroyed regions. It will have to see to it that groups of trustworthy and competent Christian men and women take the situation in hand, where this is needed, and will seek to maintain the necessary cohesion between the different local and regional centers.

How can the church help in political reconstruction?

The church will not desire to bear any direct responsibility in the political realm. But many of its leaders

have discovered that the traditional attitude of passive acceptance of all political developments is unworthy of the Christian Church which proclaims the Sovereignty of Jesus Christ over all of life. There will, therefore, be a much greater readiness to draw political consequences from the Christian message. This will first of all take the form of aggressive evangelism directed to the nation as a whole and including the proclamation of the basic Christian commandments which the masses in Germany have forgotten or rejected. For it is realized that the greatest danger for Germany is the spiritual and moral vacuum which will follow the overthrow of the regime and which will lead to new desperate forms of nihilism, if it is not overcome in time. This will be the greatest contribution which the church can make to the cause of political reconstruction.

But there is more. When it comes to finding the men who can and should accept political responsibility for the political re-orientation of the country, no other institution is better placed to propose reliable men of character than the church.

Is the church ready for these tasks?

During the last few years a great deal of preparatory work has already been done. Thus the main outline of a relief organization under the auspices of the church has been decided upon and persons have already been selected who will head that organization. Among these persons there are several who have a considerable experience in this realm either through their Christian social work or through their activities in industry or state administration. Similarly the educational problem in post-war Germany has been thoroughly studied. It may, therefore, be expected that responsible church leaders are ready to make concrete proposals.

Will the church be ready to collaborate with representatives of the victorious nations?

It is not possible to answer this question in a very definite and straightforward manner. It is a fact that even among the strongly anti-nazi circles in the German Church there are certain nationalistic elements who will consider all collaboration with the enemy as treason. It is also a fact that total bombardment (combined with outstanding ignorance about the crimes of nazis and German soldiers in occupied countries) has created even among convinced Christians a profound indignation and sometimes even hatred. And it is clear that very few Christian Germans will want to be brought in a typical "Quisling" situation in which they are considered to work *against* their own country.

But there is another side to the picture. The outstanding leaders of the German Church realize the heavy responsibility which the German people have incurred and are ready to draw the consequences. They have seen in the national socialist era, as they had not seen before, that nationalism is essentially a pagan force and they are working their way to a more truly Christian evaluation of the nation. They understand that the disaster which overtakes the German nation is so great that no responsible leader can refuse to collaborate in the work of healing and reconstruction. And if, therefore, they can be convinced that the victorious nations

do not desire to destroy the German nation but take their measures, even their measures of punishment of war-criminals and of security, for the ultimate good of the German nation, they will not refuse to help in restoring order and in setting up a new and better regime.

What should be the attitude of the other churches to the German Church?

Much will depend on the possibility of establishing relations of confidence and collaboration between the German Church and the other churches. Now the relationships which exist in and through the ecumenical movement have not been broken off during the war. While the contacts have been, of course, relatively rare, they have been maintained not only in the field of prisoners of war work but also in other fields. The great question is however what will happen when the time comes for a frank discussion. At that time two dangers will arise, namely, that the German Church should deny or minimize the particularly heavy responsibility of the German nation for the suffering of these years and that the other churches should take a Pharisaical attitude to the German Church. Unless there is real recognition of the misdeeds of Germany there can be no forgiveness and, therefore, no new beginning. But on the other hand, if the other churches speak only of condemnation and not of liberation of guilt, there will be no basis of fellowship. In this connection the churches will have to take to heart the warnings of Archbishop Temple and of Karl Barth that it is not the task of Christian nations to add to the terrific condemnation which comes to the German nation from God and which expresses itself and will express itself in very great suffering.

Again the other churches will have to help the German Church to help its nation. This will have to take the form of aid in men and in money. Much help will be needed to enable the German Church to restore its organizational life. Provisional church-centers, school buildings, theological faculties, etc., will have to be reconstructed. The great famine of Christian literature will have to be met. Special help will be needed in order to provide the means for a basically Christian process of re-education of youth.

What should be the attitude of the occupation authorities to the church?

It is clear from all that has been said that the occupation authorities have ample reason to take the German Church seriously. In the very peculiar and unprecedented situation which will follow the collapse of totalitarianism, the church can render services to them such as are not expected from the church in normal circumstances. These services will be largely indirect. They will be in the realm of spiritual and moral reconstruction and of education. For the main task of the church will be to give to men who have completely lost their bearings a new sense of orientation and to a despairing nation a new sense of purpose. But there will also be the more direct services as the church takes initiatives in the realm of relief work and helps in the finding of trustworthy men for responsible public positions.

It is then first of all necessary that the church should have full freedom to organize its own life, to render its

witness and to take again the place in national life to which it is entitled. Certain restrictions and measures of security which will apply to all German institutions will, of course, also have to be applied in the case of the church. But these restrictions should be reduced to the indispensable minimum and interfere as little as possible with the process of reconstruction of church life.

It is not a question of *using* the church for political purposes. For if the impression is created that the church is an agent of the occupying power it will certainly not be able to occupy the place of moral leadership which it should occupy. It is rather a question of allowing it to make its full contribution.

In this connection the question of *purification* of the church is of the greatest importance. Here again the best policy will be to let the church purify itself. Only in cases where regionally or locally the church proves incapable or unwilling to get rid of nazi elements or to make the necessary changes in leadership should there be interference. And even in those cases interference should as much as possible take the form of strengthening the hands of the forces of renewal in the church rather than of official intervention from the outside. At the same time it is of the utmost importance that the occupation authorities do not protect in any way the opportunistic elements or make any use of churchmen who pretend to be ready to collaborate but whom the church has good reason to distrust because of their opportunism. There are a certain number of church leaders in Germany who will be ready to offer their services to the occupying power in the same way as they have served the nazis. To use them would mean to discredit and weaken the church.

What are the first steps to be taken?

The most difficult problem in the first period of occupation will be to find the trustworthy and responsible church leaders. Of several who were in prison or concentration camps the fate is not yet known. Many others have become prisoners of war. Others again were evacuated and may not be able to get back to their parishes.

It will, therefore, be necessary, to *seek systematically* the national, regional and local key-men who can act as pioneers in the process of reconstruction of the church and of ordered society. In this connection the following suggestions may be made:

Since there is such a very great lack of pastors and since so many are in the army and are or will become prisoners of war, there are strong reasons to raise the question whether a certain number of the best pastors in prisoner of war camps should not be released for use in Germany.

In order to reorganize the church and to realize its plans for evangelism, education, relief, etc., small meetings of church leaders on a *national* scale will be necessary. It is suggested that special facilities be given for such meetings and that more generally contacts between church leaders in different zones of occupation be not only allowed but encouraged.

The whole approach to the German Church will be facilitated if the relationships which have existed and

still exist between the German Church and the other churches in the World Council of Churches are taken in consideration. It is quite clear that in the very early stage there can be no large scale inter-visitation between the German Church and other churches, but it would be of great value if a few specially chosen representa-

tives of the churches of the Allied countries—men who know the German Church well—could pay visits to the German Church leaders in order to begin the work of reconciliation, and to study how the other churches can best help the German Church in its overwhelmingly difficult task.

The World Church: News and Notes

Polish Seminaries Reopening, Bishops at Posts

Roman Catholic seminaries in Poland, which were transformed into Nazi SS schools during the German occupation, are reopening, and deported bishops have been allowed to return, August Cardinal Hlond, Primate of Poland, declared in an exclusive interview. He said that the bishops of Lodz, Lublin, Katowicz and Lomza, as well as most of the bishops of central Poland, are at their posts and have resumed their functions.

"For the moment, the Church in Poland," Cardinal Hlond said, "is suffering less than it did under the Germans, but it is harder now to get news of what is happening than during the German occupation."

The Polish churchman, who was liberated from Nazi captivity last February by the American Ninth Army at Wiedenbrueck, near Paderhorn, Germany, spoke with "pride and gratitude" of plans inaugurated by the United States hierarchy at the Orchard Lake Seminary, Detroit, to train American priests, for service to Poland.

A robust, energetic man, with wiry, short-cropped grey hair and a forceful, engaging manner, the 63-year-old prelate seemed none the worse for his prolonged period of imprisonment.

Describing the Nazi persecution of the Catholic Church in Poland, Cardinal Hlond said that when the Germans left his diocese of Posnan and Gniezno, there were only 25 priests left out of a total of 1,036 in 1939. He added that 300 of the priests are known to have been murdered, and that 189 were relegated to the general government territory, while there has been no word concerning the 500 or more priests who until recently were known to be in the Dachau concentration camp in Germany.

R. N. S.

Canadian Anglicans Vote Two Year Salary For Returning Chaplains

The Toronto Synod of the Church of England in Canada decided that arrangements should be made to pay not less than \$1,700 annually for two years to any returning military chaplains for whom civilian positions are not available.

Action was taken by the Synod when it was reported that no vacancies were open to 46 chaplains who have returned or will return shortly from the European theater of war. It was said that several parishes were not eager to accept ex-chaplains as rectors.

The Most Rev. Derwyn T. Owen, Archbishop of Toronto, declared that returning chaplains, instead of being discriminated against, should be regarded as having additional qualities and aptitudes for ministerial service as a result of their war experience. R. N. S.

German Concentration Camp Bore Slogan "There Is No God"

The entrance to the infamous Buchenwald, concentration camp in Germany bore the inscription, "There is no God," it was related by Pastor Jacques-Louis Roulet, a Swiss clergyman who was confined there for six months after having been deported from France.

Underneath this blasphemous slogan, Pastor Roulet revealed, were caricatures of a priest, a Jew and a "bourgeois" with the caption, "They are responsible."

"Religious services were not allowed in the camp," he said, "and Bibles and all religious articles were taken from new arrivals. My companions and I used to offer prayers aloud during our three-day journey in a sealed car from Belfort, France, to Weimar. We wanted to continue the custom on our first day in Buchenwald, but an old inmate told us: 'If you start that here, you'll be hanged.'"

"Forty-two thousand prisoners from 32 nations were confined there, including bishops, priests, pastors, and rabbis. Jews, and especially rabbis, were treated worst of all. Despite executions, beatings, and tortures, some rabbis managed to keep their Torahs, from which they frequently recited. We tried to encourage one another, quoting Bible verses and lines from the Psalms, but as strength diminished, our memories began to fail."

R. N. S.

Soviets Making Census of Catholic Communities

The situation of the Roman Catholic Church in the Soviet Union will become "much clearer" when a census of communities now taking place in the Ukraine, Lithuania, and Latvia have been completed, Ivan V. Polyansky, chairman of the Soviet Council on Affairs of Religious Cults, declared in an exclusive interview.

According to preliminary figures, Polyansky stated, the majority of Soviet Catholics are to be found in the Baltic Republics. He said that in Lithuania there are 700 churches, with 1,600 priests; in Latvia, 200 churches; and in Estonia, three churches, with 1,000 members. In the western Ukraine there are more than 1,000 churches scattered throughout the provinces of Lwow, Stanislawow, and Drobysh. R. N. S.

Niemöller Expected in Britain This Summer

Pastor Martin Niemöller, German Confessional Church leader, is expected to visit England this summer. The German churchman, who was recently liberated from the Nazis after eight years of imprisonment, is reported in church circles to be especially anxious

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

601 West 120th St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

JOHN C. BENNETT	RHODA E. McCULLOCH
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM	FRANCIS P. MILLER
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	EDWARD L. PARSONS
HENRY SMITH LEIPER	HOWARD C. ROBBINS
JOHN A. MACKAY	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

GLOSTER MORRIS, *Secretary of Editorial Board*

to come to the United States. It was said Niemöller wants to proclaim his belief that there is and always has been "another Germany," different from the Nazi Reich.

R. N. S.

Bishop Berggrav Presides at Norwegian Constitution Day Services

Bishop Eivind Berggrav, Primate of the Norwegian State Lutheran Church, presided at outdoor services in the great Akershus Square before a crowd of many thousands gathered to observe Norwegian Constitution Day. Taking part in the observance were Crown Prince Olav and several members of the former Government-in-Exile in London who have returned to Norway.

Sounding a keynote of thanksgiving for Norway's liberation, the Primate, obviously referring to Norwegian pro-Nazi collaborationists, declared that "it is true that God can take vengeance on the enemy's children for their ill deeds, but we must not."

R. N. S.

Dr. Temple Censured Bishop for Ordaining Deaconess to Priesthood

Action of the Anglican Bishop of Hongkong in ordaining a deaconess to the priesthood last year was censured by the late Dr. William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury, it was revealed at a session of the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury in Westminster Abbey.

Dr. Geoffrey Francis Fisher, who succeeded Dr. Temple as Archbishop of Canterbury, said it appeared the Archbishop had no jurisdiction over the Bishop of Hongkong, but that Dr. Temple had written him a letter deploring the action. Dr. Temple's letter stated:

"I cannot think that in any circumstances whatsoever an individual bishop has the right to take such a step,

Periodical Division
Detroit Public Library
5201 Woodward Ave.
Detroit 2, Mich.

650 1-46

which is most certainly contrary to all laws and precedents of the church and, therefore, I feel bound to tell you that I profoundly deplore the action you took and have to regard it as ultra vires."

R. N. S.

Archbishop of Canterbury Clarifies Views on Union Scheme

If and when the United Church of South India is inaugurated, it will not be considered a Province of the Church of England, the Upper and Lower Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury were informed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Geoffrey Francis Fisher at a session of the Full Synod in Westminster Abbey.

However, the fact that the proposed United Church would be outside the Anglican communion, the Archbishop stressed, did not mean that harmonious relations could not exist with the Church of England.

"The terms communion and intercommunion are commonly used in many different senses," he declared. "For the sake of clarity, I prefer to say that there will be real and close friendship between the proposed Church and the Church of England. How could it be otherwise when it is engaged upon such a high venture of faith and contains so large a proportion of Anglicans? But in the proper and technical sense of the word the two Churches will not as Churches be in communion with one another."

R. N. S.

Canadian Church Bodies Urge Changes in Social Structure

A more adequate wage structure, improved system of social security, better housing, and participation of the public in industrial negotiations, planning and regulation were demanded in a statement issued by the Montreal Council on Christian Social Order.

The Council, representing the Anglican, Roman Catholic, Baptist, Lutheran, Presbyterian, Russian Orthodox, Salvation Army, and United Church bodies in Canada, called for the curbing of "irresponsible ownership" in industry, and suggested that "the primacy of human rights over property rights be more fully recognized in positive law."

It warned, however, against a state collectivism which "may ensure a measure of economic security and well-being, but inevitably at the cost of essential human freedom under a totalitarian state."

R. N. S.

We have changed the format of this issue of CHRISTIANITY AND CRISIS in order to make room for Bishop Parsons' Report on the San Francisco Conference, and at the same time for what we regard as a very significant and important analysis of the place of the church in the reconstruction of Germany. No one could speak upon this subject with greater authority than the Secretary of the World Council of Churches, Dr. Visser 't Hooft, who recently arrived in this country for a brief visit.